

## REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application as amended. Claims 1-3, 6-7 and 14-16 have been amended. Claims 4-5, 8-13 and 17-18 have been cancelled without prejudice. New claims 19-22 have been added. Therefore, claims 1-3, 6-7, 14-16 and 19-22 now are presented for examination.

### 35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejection

Claims 1-3, 6-7 and 14-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Dabral et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,601,196 (“Dabral”).

Dabral discloses “[a]n apparatus . . . for debugging a bus including interposing a device that monitors the data transferred between two devices on the bus . . . .” (Abstract). The “[i]nterposer device can be configured *to transmit copies of data transmitted or received . . . .*” (col. 3, lines 7-8; emphasis provided).

In contrast, claim 1, in pertinent part, recites that “. . . the trigger is to facilitate observing and echoing of one or more of a plurality of signals transmitted on the SBD memory bus . . . .” (emphasis provided). Dabral does not teach or reasonably suggest that “. . . the trigger is to facilitate observing and echoing of one or more of a plurality of signals transmitted on the SBD memory bus . . . .” as recited by claim 1 (emphasis provided). For example, the Specification discloses “. . . an apparatus . . . for *unintrusively . . . echoing . . . signals transmitted by one of a bus* and wireless communication . . .” in order to not “*disturb [the] electrical properties of the bus*, without adding bus latency, and without adding signal discontinuities.” (Specification, page 2, lines 19-22; emphasis provided). Echoing, as opposed to transmitting, does not disturb the electrical properties of the bus. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that transmitting

copies of data as in Dabral is not the same as echoing signals, as recited in claim 1.

Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants request the withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 and its dependent claims.

Claims 6 and 14 contain limitations similar to those of claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 6 and 14 and their dependent claims.

### **35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections**

Claims 1-2, 6-7 and 14-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over La Joie et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,933,594 (“La Joie”), in view of Tanaka et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,933,594 (“Tanaka”) and knowledge which is well known in the art.

Claims 3 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Beyers U.S. Patent No. 6,072,804 (“Beyers”), La Joie, Tanaka, and in further view of Nakamura et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,496,583 (“Nakamura”).

Claims 1, 6, and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gonzalez et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,488,688 (“Gonzalez”), Tanaka and knowledge commonly known in the art.

Claims 1, 6, and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamamoto, U.S. Patent No. 5,903,719 (“Yamamoto”), Tanaka and knowledge commonly known in the art.

Claims 1, 6, and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Assouad et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,119,254 (“Assouad”), Tanaka and knowledge commonly known in the art.

Claim 1, as amended, in pertinent part, recites “a diagnostic device coupled with the buffer, the diagnostic device to facilitate one or more of detecting, accessing and reading of the plurality of echoed signals.” (emphasis provided). The cited references of Beyers, La Joie, Tanaka, Gonzales, Yamamoto, and Assouad, neither individually nor when combined in any combination, teach or reasonably suggest “a diagnostic device coupled with the buffer, the diagnostic device to facilitate one or more of detecting, accessing and reading of the plurality of echoed signals” as recited by claim 1. (emphasis provided). Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 and its dependent claims.

Claims 6 and 14 contain limitations similar to those of claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 6 and 14 and their dependent claims.

### **New Claims**

Claim 19 depends from independent claim 6, and thus includes all the limitations of the base claim from which it depends. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 19 is patentable over the cited references.

New independent claim 20 contains similar limitations to those of claim 1. Claims 21-22 depend from claim 20. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 20-22 are distinguished over the cited references.

### **Conclusion**

In light of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of the claims is hereby earnestly requested.

### **Invitation for a Telephone Interview**

The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at (303) 740-1980 if there remains any issue with allowance of the case.

### **Request for an Extension of Time**

Applicants respectfully petition for an extension of time to respond to the outstanding Office Action pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) should one be necessary. Please charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 to cover the necessary fee under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(a) for such an extension.

### **Charge our Deposit Account**

Please charge any shortage to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: 8-3-05

  
Aslam A. Jaffery  
Reg. No. 51,841

12400 Wilshire Boulevard  
7<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Los Angeles, California 90025-1030  
(303) 740-1980